

BRIEF OUTLINE OF THE NATURE
and AIMS OF PACIFISM.

Alfred H. Fried.

The objections raised against the Peace Movement are mostly based upon an entirely wrong conception of the problem. Generally those ideas that are so strongly combatted, refuted and ridiculed are for the most part not involved at all.

The following paragraphs contain a brief outline of the fundamental ideas of Pacifism, which show how unfounded the common objections are.

It is not intended thereby to convert every adversary to Pacifism, but to crystallize the controversy and center it about the real issues.

CONTENTS

I. "Eternal Peace"	5
II. International Organization	6
III. Settlement of Disputes Without Force	8
IV. "Disarmament"	9
V. "War" under the Condition of International Organization	10
VI. What is "War"?	11
VII. The Nation and International Organization	12
VIII. Human Nature	13
IX. Extent and Effect of the Pacifist Movement	14
X. Peace "At Any Price"	17
XI. The Attitude of Pacifism Toward War under the Present Condition of International Disor- ganization	18

NATURE AND AIMS OF PACIFISM

I

"ETERNAL PEACE"

One must discriminate between "No War" and "Peace."

The condition existing at present under normal circumstances between nations is not that of *peace*, as understood by Pacifism, but merely that of *no war*. Nor is it the object of the peace movement to bring about that peace which is made after a war. Such peace merely terminates war; it does not found peace. (An analogy as an illustration: A drunkard sober between drinks is not an abstainer.)

Who does not discriminate between "peace" and "no war" does not understand the fundamental principle of Pacifism; he reaches conclusions that do not touch the problem.

Only the so-called state of "peace" which really is a state of "no war" can be prolonged by ever-increasing armaments. (Therefore: "Si vis pacem, para bellum.") But this condition cannot be maintained permanently. (Therefore: "Eternal peace is but a dream.") These conclusions are right in themselves, but their premises are wrong.

Peace as understood by Pacifism means a condition of organized living together of nations.

The disorganization ("anarchy") existing to-day in the relations between nations is gradually being replaced by International Organization.

The fundamental problem of Pacifism, therefore, is not the alleged desire permanently to avoid the conflict of war without changing the present disorganization still existing between nations, nor to establish "Eternal Peace"—which under present conditions would be impossible and which in reality would not mean peace. What Pacifism really wants is to do away

with that condition of disorganization by developing international organization from which, besides other advantages, automatically will result the possibility of settling all disputes between nations without force.

In short, Pacifism aims not to treat the symptoms, but to remove the causes.

II

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

(a) *Definition*

This does *not* mean *World State* nor *United States*, nor *World Federation of nations*; does *not* mean the dissolution of all nations into one League of Humanity; does *not* mean the abolition of national autonomy nor submission under one centralized power.

But it means a *voluntary co-operation of autonomous nations* for their common interest, a greater efficiency for obtaining their means of subsistence and a better guarantee for their security with the least waste of energy, on account of this mutual co-operation. (A substitution of the ideal of might by the ideals of co-operation and mutual obligations.)

(b) *How is this to be obtained?*

International organization cannot be capriciously constructed; its growth is dependent on those natural laws that determine human progress. Mechanical forces have built and made our society. They lead mankind on to ever higher forms of organization, from the isolated cave-dweller to modern world-empires and unions of nations, and finally beyond this toward world organization.

The process of international organization has been working *for a long time*. The entire lack of organization in the relations between states long ago ceased to exist. And more and more and with increasing acceleration nations have become organized and dependent upon each other. Economics

have expanded into world-economics. World trade has created international credit, world markets and an international interdependence and has brought about an inseparable world-community of interests. The nations have formed countless world-unions, and an efficient and extensive international administration is in operation. The number of international treaties and agreements concerning economic, social, hygienic, political, ethical, legal and scientific activities is constantly increasing. Public world congresses for the management of the common matters of civilization have become permanent institutions. All of these things are both the symptom and the evidence of the constant increase of international organization that will gradually replace the present disorganization.*

This process constitutes the problem of Pacifism.

Pacifism need not itself create international organization. It merely has to recognize it and to call attention to its growth. It merely wants to lay bare this natural trend of development in order that men may direct their actions in accordance with it and thus accelerate the process of organization. (Catalytic reaction.)

(c) *The Effects*

The transformation of international life will result in a change of society. In such degree as organization supersedes disorganization, crude force will cease to play a rôle in international relations. (One sees that not War is to be eliminated, but its *causes*.)

Conflicts between nations will not disappear, any more than they have ceased to exist between individuals. *But their character will be changed.* The less they are caused by disorganization and the more they emanate from organization, the

*For further details see A. H. Fried's "Handbuch der Friedensbewegung," 2nd edition, Vol. I, Chap. 3. "Die Organisation des Weltfriedens." "Das internationale Leben der Gegenwart." (Teubner, Leipzig, English translation publ. by Holt, New York.) "Annuaire de la Vie Internationale" (Misch & Thron, Brussels), which comprises the constitution, history and activities of all existing international unions. (See also Bridgman, World Organization, published by The World Peace Foundation, Boston, Mass.)

less menacing will disputes become and the easier will it be to settle them by the application of reason.

III

SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES WITHOUT FORCE

This does not mean to replace the settlement by force through settlement by law. It is an error to believe that under present conditions Pacifism wants to settle all conflicts between nations by arbitration (as most of these conflicts are produced by the very lack of organization between nations). *It is not a question of doing away with the consequences without the causes having been changed, and therefore not of creating institutions of law for the settlement of disputes between nations, but rather to change the character of these disputes so as to make possible a settlement through rational means.** This transformation will be effected through the growth of organization between states.

Arbitration is, moreover, only *one* way of settling disputes without force; *not* the only one. The most preferable way will always be settlement by exchanging advantages and by compromising, particularly during the present period of transition from disorganization to organization. The more these conflicts assume legal character, the more will they be governed and decided by principles of law so that the settlement of disputes by institutions of law (arbitration, judicial settlement, committees of investigation) will mean an acceleration in the procedure of settlement.

* It is necessary to realize that the casues of war have a twofold character. Wars may result from a real case of dispute, or simply from a desire for conquest. Disputes always have some legal basis and could be settled by principles of law or mutual compromise. Formerly, also such cases were settled by force, but to-day practically all of them are settled without force. Against the desire for conquest there is no influence of law. It is illegal (anarchic) in its nature. It may be prevented by threat or repulsed by force. But the application of force for the prevention of disorganized force is *not war* in the modern sense. (See Chapters V and VI.)

IV

"DISARMAMENT"

The mutual competition of armaments is one of the gravest consequences of the disorganization between nations, and at the same time its most visible evidence.

The absence of security by mutual guarantee compels every nation to seek to protect itself by its own armaments, and this provokes on the part of the other nations counter-measures against every defensive measure. Thus every defensive measure of one nation reacts upon others and creates a new menace to the nation which has increased its armaments. This leads to the ruinous and never-ending competition of armaments, which exhausts the people of every nation.

These endless armament increases can achieve neither absolute security nor peace as understood by Pacifism. They only make the outbreak of war more difficult, but they can merely serve to prolong that condition that has been characterized as "no war." (See above, Chapter I.)

Pacifism, of course, does not think of accelerating the elimination of the present international disorganization through disarmament, i.e., to attempt to change a cause by removing its consequences. To the Pacifist the competition of armaments is but a symptom of the present disorganization, which with the development of international organization will gradually disappear. For there are in this very complex problem various grades which cannot be adequately characterized by the word "disarmament." We must distinguish between "Unlimited Competition of Armaments," "Limitation of Armaments," "Temporary Stand-still of Armaments," with continually growing intervals, "Reduction of Armaments" and "Total Disarmament." Pacifism holds both extremes, total disarmament as well as unlimited competition of armaments, equally senseless. The solution lies between these extremes. In proportion to the development of international organization will the single intermediary solutions be effected. The problem for the present is, in order to check at least partly the intolerable waste of energy through stipulated regulations, to equalize armaments.

V

“WAR” UNDER THE CONDITION OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Total disarmament is not thought of, not even when international organization will be established. For even then the necessity of applying physical force would not be done away with any more than it is within the nation of to-day. The possibility must be assumed that within international organization nations will still have to resist attacks from less civilized countries which refuse to join or which must of necessity be kept out of it. It is possible, also, that nations will have to defend themselves from lawbreakers within the community of nations. The employment of force will, however, become *extremely rare*, but should it nevertheless prove necessary, *it will not be “war” in the present sense*, if only because it will not be a supreme effort on the part of the whole organism, as war is to-day for the nation. It will only be made by the organs established for this purpose, without strongly affecting the normal life of the nation, just as to-day some police action does not affect the life of civilized nations. The security of organized nations will be absolutely effected through precisely that organization. *But the application of force will be fundamentally different from “war” of to-day. Force will serve law, and not—as in war—substitute for it.* It will but establish law, without violating it, and therefore leave behind no hatred, nor any desire for revenge. Application of force will, therefore, never be a matter of glory, but merely a simple duty, and thus the cult of force, to which history at present is subservient will totally disappear. *It will no longer be disorganized force, but regulated force. And regulated force is law.* The burglar who kills the man in the street exercises anarchic force; the policeman who kills the burglar practices regulated force. The actions are the same in both cases, but they are different in nature.

It is apparent, therefore, that the mirage of “eternal peace” is not found in the program of Pacifism.

VI

WHAT IS "WAR"?

During the period when nations were isolated units, the business of politics was to execute the will of the nation as against the outside. It was carried out peacefully so long as there was no opposition; by force when there was, which was the usual thing under a condition of total disorganization in the relations between states. War was a permanent institution destined to carry out the nations' needs, and was really, as Clausewitz defined it, "the continuation of politics, only by other means." In the present time of increasing and almost accomplished international organization, politics have become the art of securing the various interests of individual nations in such a way as not to interfere with the common interests of all other nations. *War is no longer the "continuation" of politics, but their failure.*

War has, therefore, to-day ceased to be an *institution*; it is a *condition* which may occasionally occur owing to the lack of the establishment of international order, and owing to that particular disorganization that still allows individual nations to obtain real or supposed advantages over other nations. *The condition of war is the outcome of anarchic motives.*

The application of force in itself is not necessarily characterized by war. In the latter we can see working two different kinds of force—attack and defense—which equally create that complexity of conditions which make themselves felt as evil (waste of life and wealth, devastating diseases, interruption of traffic and intercourse, of law, economics, etc.). The one is the application of force emanating from disorganized conditions, and the other that of the regulated force opposed to it for its control. *Only he who applies the first kind of force is responsible for these evils, only he literally "makes" war.* Not he who resists it. The action due to this disorganized condition—not necessarily always the assailant's—is the *primary* cause of war; resistance only a *secondary* form, its complement. (See Chapter V, concerning disorganized and regulated force.)

"Preventive" Pacifism, in its fight against war, is, of course,

ranged against the underlying causes of war, i.e., application of force arising from disorganized conditions; not against the resistance impelled by it, which is but its consequence.

But as a rule it is exactly this secondary form of war that those who oppose Pacifism have in mind, because they think that war may also be necessary or even moral. But what appears necessary or moral in this case is not war itself, but only that secondary action, the resistance against it; this protection against aggression is, therefore, precisely what Pacifism seeks to achieve through the more rational means of prevention.

VII

THE NATION AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

The misconceptions as to the nature and aims of Pacifism have caused the reproach of an anti-national attitude, especially the erroneous assumption as if it were a question of limiting the armaments merely of one's own nation, and of the so-called "Peace at any price," i.e., the abandonment of all resistance against aggression, of opposition to armies by principle. Such ideas are against reason. They have nothing to do with the true nature and aims of Pacifism. Besides that, for many people with strong patriotic feeling, the word "international" includes a significance of anti-national." As a matter of fact, the conception "international," in its true meaning, plays absolutely no part in Pacifism. It only appears to do so because we are accustomed to it in our terminology, and because it is used rather on account of its conciseness and adaptability. The Pacifist ideal is not concerned with the relations between nationalities, but between nations, i.e., with the governments and the people (often of mixed nationalities), for which a term like "zwischenstaatlich," i.e., "as between states" or "inter-governmental," would be more expressive. The union between states that is in question should serve, first of all, to secure for each nation advantages which it could not obtain by itself, or only by disproportionate sacrifices. "Inter-

nationalism," in its modern sense, is therefore not an anti-national, but a very national conception; its true meaning is the obtaining the highest welfare and security with the least waste of energy.

The main reason why this is so often misunderstood by the opponents of Pacifism, and, indeed, why they often denounce these patriotic aims as being unpatriotic, is that they still look upon each nation as a separate unit, incoherent, self-contained and utterly independent of other nations; therefore they consider the peace movement as a force working exclusively within their own respective countries.

The peace movement is working in all countries, and, whether it has more or less support in one country or another, it is always based upon the co-operation of all civilized nations. In asking for means of securing world peace, the creation of international order and the abandonment of conquest, it does not expect any one single nation to fulfill these demands while the others remain deaf to them; the solution of the problem can only be achieved by common action. Thus understood, these efforts protect every nation in the most practical and most "patriotic" sense.

VIII

HUMAN NATURE

Not struggle is to be eliminated, but only its crudest form, physical struggle. This is a process that is developing almost automatically; the whole evolution of mankind has more and more narrowed the plane of physical force and replaced it by spiritual struggle. To contest this would mean to contest history. Only between nations physical force is still applied, and even there not without certain restrictions. Psychic force has already gained a prominent place. Even the present competition of armaments may sometimes be called "a war of numbers," and, therefore, psychical struggle. *As a rule, the power concentrated in the armies and navies is not exercised any more, but merely indicated, as with a bank the paper money*

merely indicates its actual capital lying in its safes. Struggle is not eliminated through its refining; this only makes it more complex and more manifold. And the more it becomes complex, the less effective will physical force be, and only struggle is the father of all things; not—as one so readily confuses it—war, which is becoming more and more an impediment to progress.

In nature, "struggle for existence" is never carried on for the extinction of its own species. Among all living beings this tragic destiny may only be observed in mankind.

On the other hand, throughout nature the law of "*mutual assistance*" prevails among the same species. The struggle for existence has a justification only in the struggle of man against nature because only there is it productive, and it is exactly this struggle that drives men to co-operation and to organization. *Thus even the natural "law of struggle" justifies pacifism.*

It is not necessary, as skeptics hold, for men to become "angels" before war can be eliminated from international relations. They only need to be what they are by nature: *egoists*; but egoists who must first learn to realize their true interests.

From this results the invalidity of the objection that war is ineradicable because it is grounded in "human nature." But supposing this objection were justified: *Sexual instinct is also grounded in human nature. Nevertheless society knows how to protect itself when some one oversteps the barriers it has erected against this powerful natural instinct. Nobody would any longer excuse sexual criminals by pleading "natural laws."*

IX

EXTENT AND EFFECT OF THE PACIFIST MOVEMENT

The extent of Pacifism is not limited to the societies formed for propagating it (peace societies and similar organizations).

These are but the *visible signs* of a condition that is due to, and inseparably connected with, the character of modern civilization. Everyone who works in the direction of civilization promotes pacifism. Almost all our modern institutions are means to its realization. The number of those working in the direction of Pacifism is immeasurable. It is by no means identical with the number of the members of peace organizations. There we find united only the conscious and leading Pacifists. But besides that, there are the great masses of unconscious Pacifists who work without willing it, simply through the pressure of things directing them. Then there are those who, though convinced, are too easy-going to take a leading part. The opponents, too, are co-workers, for their pressure exacts reaction.

It would be entirely wrong to believe that the Pacifist organizations had been founded in order to carry the peace idea artificially from outside into our present time. In reality they are born out of the present time and indicate its true tendency. How ridiculous, therefore, to fight the peace organizations! As if one should destroy the thermometer to diminish heat or cold!

Nor do the Pacifist organizations form one distinct unit. There is no such thing as an "International League of peace" extending all over the world, as some people think. The various Pacifist organizations are created by the various political tendencies of our time and have the physiognomy and character of the different elements that compose them.

According to the different principles upon which they are formed or to the different viewpoints which they put into the foreground (as religious, scientific, social, philosophical views) they are striving for various goals by different methods, or they confine themselves to certain partial aims. The only thing they have in common is:

- (1) the *starting point*, which is the opposition against the present system of international relations;
- (2) the *direction of their efforts*, which is to alter that system.

From this it follows that the *whole of Pacifism* can never be held responsible for the viewpoint, activities and methods

of each of the single organizations. Pacifism is only the highest scientific doctrine, which must accord with the actual state of politics.

For the rest, it is not necessary to decide which organization is the best or the most consistent and most effective, each of them being adapted to a different circle and therefore *serving their cause in their own field, and not in that of any other organization*. Just as one's coat must be cut to one's own measure, and one universal measure for humanity would be impossible, so must the nature of the Pacifist organization adapt itself to the various material and spiritual needs of men.

It is not, therefore, so much a question of creating the one organization that applies the one right method and holds to the one right formal aim, but rather to have organizations adapted for all measures of purpose and strength. In accordance to the moral: the final aim is nothing; *the movement is everything*.

One must not believe that any peace organization will some day bring about universal peace by applying a better program or a better method. This will not be achieved by a sudden acceptance of recommended principles of any branch of the general movement; but by a gradual penetration of Pacifism into the national mind whereby its leading men often unconsciously and without being converted will begin to *act* in accordance to Pacifism after others have worked out the ideas of Pacifism. Universal peace will come about through an entire change of ideas and of estimation of advantages. This general change of ideas will be effected not because Pacifism has put forward certain claims, but solely *because of the movement that it has started, the thinking that it has awakened, the discussion for and against its claims that it has created*. Not the uniformity and consistency of the peace programs, nor the number of subscribing members of the single peace societies will effect this change, but the strength, the power and the extent of the whole movement, and through this its growing influence and acceleration.

X

PEACE "AT ANY PRICE"

In order to express a distinct difference, the representatives of the peace movement, who generally had been called "Peace Advocates," or "Friends of Peace" ("Friedens-freunde"), named themselves "Pacifists." For there is a fundamental difference between being a "Friend of peace" and a "Pacifist." Every normal man will look upon war as evil, and will agree to the desirability of peace and therefore be a "*friend of peace*." Even the most ardent militarist will feel this way. But that does not yet make one a "Pacifist"; first, because to the mere friend of peace it is only a question of having "no war," which differs essentially from the Pacifist conception of peace, as has been shown at the beginning of this discussion. Moreover, the "friend of peace" will desire a condition without war only so long as an actual conflict or some real or supposed interests of his own people do not impel him to think that a settlement by force might be useful. *He will be a "friend of peace" as long as no actual war is in prospect, and as long as his desires seem satisfied.* But he will always reckon with war as a necessary and valuable medium. The Pacifist, to whom peace means not merely a pause in the employment of force between two wars, but the substitution of international disorder by international order and law, does not content himself to being solely a "friend" of this "peace," which means the pause between wars, but seeks to create means and guarantees that make it possible to avoid application of force precisely in case that serious conflict should arise. *The Pacifist does not content himself to love peace in times of peace, but aims to secure international order for the case of conflict.*

This attitude appears, of course, most conspicuously during times of impending conflict when public opinion is stirred to war. Thus the Pacifists have borne with the reproach of their opponents, that they wish "*peace at any price*." This reproach embodies a stigma of lack of patriotism. It would imply that Pacifists want to avoid war even when national honor and national interests are endangered. It creates the impression that Pacifists are guided by senseless fanaticism, just as the

fanatics of law in earlier times formulated the proposition, "Fiat justitia, pereat mundus." Therefore, the Pacifists, in their struggle to avoid war, *would go so far as to cause a greater evil*. This, of course, would be illogical. But in all striving for human betterment, logic is the valve which prevents reason from becoming nonsense, benefit from becoming misery. The elimination of war is aimed at by the Pacifists only to secure advantages for humanity. This regulates the "price" at which peace shall be secured. *The fact that we ask for peace only so long as it means an advantage over war is the valve that automatically prevents the Pacifist aims from falling into the extreme which their opponents attribute to them by accusing them of aiming at "peace at any price."*

This logic has but to be comprehended. The adversaries of Pacifism who cannot *or will not* understand this by making such reproaches merely seek to obtain a *freehand* for inciting war, which has already been interfered with seriously through the Pacifist propaganda. They only want to nullify the forces of reason that are working for peace by *discrediting them*. *The slogan "peace at any price" has no other meaning than to protect those who are making war from interference, and to safeguard the interests of a few at the expense of the welfare of the community.*

XI

THE ATTITUDE OF PACIFISM TOWARD WAR UNDER THE PRESENT CONDITION OF INTERNATIONAL DISORGANIZATION

The peace movement works against war because war is still possible and constantly impending. *This is the justification of its existence. The movement would be superfluous if a condition of peace were assured.*

Curiously this simple truth is misunderstood by the public to an incredible extent. For it is precisely during a time of international disturbance and of impending armed conflict that the peace movement is called untimely. *As though to*

work for peace were justified only when its breaking appeared impossible! The fact that a crisis exists can never make appear unnecessary the efforts to prevent it. Hygienic propaganda is not superfluous because, on account of a lack of proper sanitary precautions, pestilences actually do arise. The demand for impregnation of inflammable material is not useless because fires actually do break out because no such preventive measures have been taken.

The wrong conception as to the position of Pacifism toward actual war may be due to the superstitious belief that war is a natural phenomena beyond human control. This is why Pacifists are usually looked upon as people whose attitude toward this alleged inevitability is to confine themselves to "loving" and "praising" peace, as one prefers a smooth sea to a rough sea or fine weather to cloudburst. In the same way one confines oneself to regarding Pacifists as people who prefer the good and the beautiful to the bad and ugly, but whom one has to pity when events occur which are no more "good" and "beautiful" and which are therefore believed to be very disappointing to them. Such must have been the trend of thought of the high official who, during the Balkan crisis, said to me, "*I would not like to be a Pacifist at present,*" which means, of course, "I only want to be a friend of fine weather when the sun shines, because otherwise in storm and rain I would have to suffer for my predelictions." It is hardly necessary to show how distorted this view is, least of all to those who have read the foregoing fundamental argumentations.

Then there are those who make Pacifists responsible when war breaks out. They cry out upon us emphatically and accuse us of hypocrisy because we were working against war only in time of so-called peace, when, in their opinion, it is unnecessary to do so. They do not know that one cannot fight actual war, that one must change the causes that provoke it, in order to shun the outbreak of hell. To them we say, "*We are not firemen whom one calls in to put out a fire. We are but the supporters of a medium for fireproofing which by timely application would prevent the conflagration.*"

PRESIDENT WILSON'S APPEAL FOR IMPARTIALITY AND RESTRAINT IN DIS- CUSSING THE WAR

MY FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN: I suppose that every thoughtful man in America has asked himself during the last troubled weeks what influence the European war may exert upon the United States, and I take the liberty of addressing a few words to you in order to point out that it is entirely within our own choice what its effects upon us will be and to urge very earnestly upon you the sort of speech and conduct which will best safeguard the nation against distress and disaster.

The effect of the war upon the United States will depend upon what American citizens say or do. Every man who really loves America will act and speak in the true spirit of neutrality, which is the spirit of impartiality and fairness and friendliness to all concerned. The spirit of the nation in this critical matter will be determined largely by what individuals and society and those gathered in public meetings do and say, upon what newspapers and magazines contain, upon what our ministers utter in their pulpits and men proclaim as their opinions on the streets.

The people of the United States are drawn from many nations, and chiefly from the nations now at war. It is natural and inevitable that there should be the utmost variety of sympathy and desire among them with regard to the issues and circumstances of the conflict. Some will wish one nation, others another, to succeed in the momentous struggle. It will be easy to excite passion and difficult to allay it. Those responsible for exciting it will assume a heavy responsibility; responsibility for no less a thing than that the people of the United States, whose love of their country and whose loyalty to its Government should unite them as Americans all, bound in honor and affection to think first of her and her interests, may be divided in camps of hostile opinions, hot against each other, involved in the war itself in impulse and opinion, if not in action. Such diversions among us would be fatal to our peace of mind and might seriously stand in the way of the proper performance of our duty as the one great nation at peace, the one people holding itself ready to play a part of impartial mediation and speak the counsels of peace and accommodation, not as a partisan, but as a friend.

I venture, therefore, my fellow-countrymen, to speak a solemn word of warning to you against that deepest, most subtle, most essential breach of neutrality which may spring out of partisanship, out of passionately taking sides. The United States must be neutral in fact as well as in name during these days that are to try men's souls. We must be impartial in thought as well as in action, must put a curb upon our sentiments as well as upon every transaction that might be construed as a preference of one party to the struggle before another.

My thought is of America. I am speaking, I feel sure, the earnest wish and purpose of every thoughtful American that this great country of ours, which is, of course, the first in our thoughts and in our hearts, should show herself in this time of peculiar trial a nation fit beyond others to exhibit the fine poise of undisturbed judgment, the dignity of self-control, the efficiency of dispassionate action, a nation that neither sits in judgment upon others nor is disturbed in her own counsels and which keeps herself fit and free to do what is honest and disinterested and truly serviceable for the peace of the world.

Shall we not resolve to put upon ourselves the restraint which will bring to our people the happiness and the great and lasting influence for peace we covet for them?

WOODROW WILSON.

WASHINGTON, D. C.
August 18, 1914.